

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-42 are pending and stand rejected. Please cancel claims 2-6, 16-20 and 30-34 without prejudice to refiling.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Office Action at 2-3. Applicant respectfully disagrees because the drawings show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. For example, embodiments of the features of independent claim 1 are shown in Figs. 1 (elements 320 and 325), 5, 6, 11A, 11B, and 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically identify the features of the invention specified in the claims that are missing from the drawings.

The Office Action objected that the title of the invention is not descriptive and suggested the title "Performing SQL Query Optimization by Simplifying Sub-Expressions." Office Action at 3. Applicant has amended the title as suggested.

The Office Action objected regarding the use of trademarks in the specification. Office Action at 3. Applicant has amended paragraph [0013] of the specification to address this objection.

The Office Action required correction of a typographical error in paragraph [0003]. Office Action at 3. Paragraph [0003] has been amended to correct the typographical error. In addition, Applicant has amended Paragraphs [0026], [0027], [0031], [0034], [0035], and [0041] to correct typographical errors.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-42 under 35 USC 101 arguing that the disclosed subject matter does not produce a tangible result. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29 to address this rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected the pending claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,665,664 (hereinafter "Paulley") alone or in combination with one of United States Patent Nos. 5,590,324 and 6,618,719 and Esko Nuuttila, "Transitive Closure," Helsinki University of Technology, 9 October 1995. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29 to address these rejections. Applicant contends that none of the cited prior art shows all of the elements of amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29. Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29 are patentable over the prior art. Similarly, the pending dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **SUMMARY**

Applicant contends that the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. Should any fees be required with the submission of this response, Applicant requests that the fees be debited from deposit account number 50-4370.

Respectfully submitted,

/Howard L. Speight/

Howard L. Speight

Reg. No. 37,733

9601 Katy Freeway

Suite 280

Houston, Texas 77024

(713) 881-9600 (phone)

(713) 715-7384 (facsimile)

howard@hspeight.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Date: December 19, 2007